REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This communication is responsive to the Final Office Action of January 19, 2007 as well as to the telephonic interview with Examiners Lin Ye and Supervisory Examiner David Ometz on April 5, 2007.

Applicant has umended Claim 2 and canceled all remaining Claims.

EXAMINER TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW April 5, 2007

The Applicant appreciates the Telephonic Interview of April 5, 2007 and the Examiners' review of Applicant's proposed amendments of Claim 2.

The Applicant proposed an amendment of Claim 2 to include the limitations of the base Claim 1 from which it depended and the cancellation of all remaining Claims.

The Applicant respectfully requested a reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of Claim 2 on the grounds that the Nicholson reference does not disclose, or anticipate, a planetary member as recited in Applicant's Claim 2 which converts relative rotation of guide and Mirror wheels into tilting of the tilt mirror. The Nicholson idlers (90) cited by the Examiner in the Final Office Action (page 3) are not planetary members because: 1) they perform no conversion of relative rotation between members, rather they engage a common belt (32); and 2) they do not engage the tilt mirror, only the common belt (32).

Supervisory Examiner Ometz and Primary Examiner Ye appeared receptive to these arguments and agreed to consider this amendment of the Claims.

3 CLAIMS 1-7 REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nicholson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,543,954).

The Applicant has amended Claim 2 and canceled all remaining Claims.

Reply to Otton Assists of Jensery 19, 2007

The Examiner has cited the Nicholson reference as disclosing a planetary member in the form of drive belt 90. The Applicant respectfully rejects that characterization. Element 90 in the Nicholson reference is one of two opposing idlers which effect a 90 degree bend of drive belt 88 between the 'Y' axis drive ring 42 and the primary drive ring 34. Idlers, 90, are not planetary members because: Firstly; they perform no conversion of relative rotation between members, rather they engage a common belt (32); and secondly, they do not engage the tilt mirror, only the common belt (32). Such element is not disclosed in the Nicholson reference and therefore is not anticipated by same. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection as to remaining Independent Claim 2.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, and the amendments to the Claims, Applicant respectfully submits that remaining Claim 2 has been placed in a condition for allowance, and requests that it be allowed. Early notice to this effect is solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1338 (Docket No. STGUP008).

Respectfully submitted.

IP CREATORS

Charles C. Carl

Registration No. 36,764

Date: April 27, 2007

P.O. Box 2789 Cupertino, CA 95015

Tel: (408) 850-9585 Fax: (408) 850-9585

E-mail: cecary@ipereators.com